

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER ONR - 1	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) The Impact of Family Structure on the Structure of Work		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Interim
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Sara Yogeve and Jeanne Brett		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-83-K-0049
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Center for Urban Affairs & Policy Research Northwestern University 2040 Sheridan Rd., Evanston, Ill. 60201		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS NR170-956
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Organizational Effectiveness Research Group (Code 442) Office of Naval Research, Arlington, VA 22217		12. REPORT DATE July 1983
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 29
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the U.S. Government.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Marital Satisfaction, Housework, Childcare.		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Dual earner couples (136) and housewives couples (103) were studied. The focus was on the relationship between marital satisfaction and satisfaction with housework and childcare arrangements, doing own share of housework and childcare and perceiving spouse as doing his/her share of housework and childcare. Analysis was done at both individual and couple levels. At both levels of analysis, satisfaction with housework and childcare arrangements and perceiving spouse as doing his/her share of housework and childcare		

predict marital satisfaction. None of the traditional variables: income, family stage, wife's employment status and sex predict marital satisfaction.

Perceptions of own contribution to housework and childcare are not correlated to marital satisfaction among men, but, women who are satisfied with their marriage perceive themselves as doing less than their share of family work. In all three couples' patterns (one in dual earners and two in housewives couples) the perception which distinguishes between spouses who are satisfied with marriage and those who are not is that the other spouse is doing his/her share of family work.

ONR-1

PERCEPTIONS OF THE DIVISION OF
HOUSEWORK AND CHILDCARE
AND MARITAL SATISFACTION.

*The Impact of Family Structure
on the Structure of Work.*

Sara Yogeve
Research Associate
Center for Urban Affairs
and Policy Research
Northwestern University
2040 Sheridan Road
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Jeanne Brett
Professor
Kellogg Graduate School of
Management
Northwestern University,
3-186 Leverone Building
Evanston, Illinois 60201

This research was supported in part by Office of Naval Research - Organizational Effectiveness Research Group - Contract N00014-83-K-0049.

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the U.S. Government.

Abstract

Dual earner couples (136) and housewives couples (103) were studied. The focus was on the relationship between marital satisfaction and satisfaction with housework and childcare arrangements, doing own share of housework and childcare and perceiving spouse as doing his/her share of housework and childcare. Analysis was done at both individual and couple levels. At both levels of analysis, satisfaction with housework and childcare arrangements and perceiving spouse as doing his/her share of housework and childcare predict marital satisfaction . None of the traditional variables: income, family stage, wife's employment status and sex predict marital satisfaction.

Perceptions of own contribution to housework and childcare are not correlated to marital satisfaction among men, but, women who are satisfied with their marriage perceive themselves as doing less than their share of family work. In all three couples' patterns (one in dual earners and two in housewives couples) the perception which distinguishes between spouses who are satisfied with marriage and those who are not is that the other spouse is doing his/her share of family work.

Perceptions of the Division of Housework and Childcare
and Marital Satisfaction

The literature investigating the impact of women's employment on family life has two distinct foci: 1) marital satisfaction and happiness and 2) the division of housework and childcare. These two lines of research run parallel to each other in the marriage and family literature but there is little theorizing and no empirical work on the relationships between marital satisfaction and the division of housework and childcare. This paper hypothesizes that perceptions of the division of housework and childcare predicts marital satisfaction regardless of whether or not the wife is employed. More specifically, we hypothesize that perceptions of an equitable distribution of housework and childcare are related to satisfaction with housework and childcare arrangements and marital satisfaction. This hypothesis, if supported empirically, can explain much of the controversial findings about the effect of women's employment on marital satisfaction and the effect of women's employment on the division of housework and childcare.

Yogev (1982a) shows that the literature on marital satisfaction falls into two patterns: the pre-1970 research typically concludes that marital dissatisfaction and conflict is higher when the wife is working than when she is not. (Gover, 1963; Axelson, 1963; Blood, 1963; Nye, 1963; Blood & Wolfe, 1960). The post-1970 research finds either no significant differences in satisfaction between traditional and working spouses (Staines, Pleck, Shepard, & O'Conner, 1978; Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976) or that employed women are

happier with their marriages than housewives (Birnbaum, 1971; Arnott, 1972, Safilios-Rothschild, 1970). Yoge (1982a) points out that underlying the post-1970 research is a contemporary view of marriage and family which recognizes the changes in domestic life and normative role behavior of men and women which have occurred.

The interpretation of the impact of women's employment on the distribution of housework and childcare is also controversial. Some studies show that when wives enter the workforce, husbands increase their participation in housework and childcare (Dizard, 1968; Garland, 1972; Miller, 1972; Rapaport and Rapaport, 1969; 1971). Other studies show extensive interchangeability of tasks (Holmstrom, 1972; Bailyn, 1970; Bahr, 1974; Young and Wilmott, 1973).

In contrast, is substantial research showing that family tasks are strongly segregated by sex, regardless of the wife's employment status, (Pleck, 1979; Weingarten, 1978). Furthermore, working wives do a disproportionate share of childcare (Bryson, Bryson and Johnson, 1978) and housework (Paloma and Garland, 1971). The exceptional situations in which the wife is not solely responsible for the housework occur when the husband has been socialized by egalitarian sex role ideology (Perrucci, Potter & Rhoads, 1978) or when income is high and the couple can afford to hire help and does so (Safilios-Rothchild, 1970). The overall notion is that women still bear the lion share of housework and childcare even when they are employed.

The controversial nature of the research findings in both the literature on marital satisfaction and the division of housework and childcare suggests that a woman's employment status per se is neither

a major factor affecting marital satisfaction nor a major factor affecting the division of housework and childcare. The patterns of marital satisfaction and the division of housework and childcare within groups of traditional and dual-earner couples are far too complex for this to be true.

We propose that satisfaction with the housework and childcare arrangements, perceptions of both husband and wife that each is doing his/her own fair share of the housework and childcare, and perceptions of both husband and wife that the other is doing his/her fair share predict marital satisfaction. When both spouses hold these perceptions, neither feels exploited and other things being equal, each should be satisfied with the arrangements and with the marriage. We believe this hypothesis applies to both traditional and dual-earner couples. While the actual division of housework and childcare may vary greatly between traditional and dual-earner couples, so long as each spouse perceives that the division is equitable and is satisfied with it, marital satisfaction should be high.

Our hypothesis is consistent with the observations of several marital and family therapists who have been working with dual-career couples (Price-Bonham and Murphy, 1980; Rice, 1979, Yoge, 1983). They report that sharing of family work is one of the critical issues these families face. They also find a strong relationship between marital satisfaction and the successful resolution of the division of housework and childcare. We believe that these issues are important not only to dual-career couples who are in therapy but to all couples--dual-earner as well as housewives couples.

Design of the Study

Model Specification

The research on marital satisfaction and the division of housework and childcare tends to focus on one predictor variable per study. For example, the numerous studies cited previously correlating wife's employment status and marital satisfaction and division of housework and childcare. In addition, several studies have found a curvilinear relationship between marital satisfaction and family stage, with the lowest levels of satisfaction in mid life because of strains of careers and parenting and higher satisfaction in the first years of marriage, before children, and again after children have left home (Riley & Spreitzer, 1974; Rollins & Cannon, 1974; Spanier, Lewis & Coles, 1975). Marriage has also been found to be more important to women than to men (Lee, 1978). Other research shows that wives make a bigger ego investment in their marital relationships than their husbands (Gluck, Dannefer & Milea, 1980). Finally, as previously cited division of housework and childcare has been found to be associated with income (Safilios-Rothschild, 1970). This focus on one predictor variable at a time precludes inferences being drawn about the unique contribution of the predictor variable being studied over and above other variables. In order to be able to draw inferences about the unique contribution of perceptions of the distribution of housework and childcare to the prediction of marital satisfaction, we have included all these traditional predictors of marital satisfaction and distribution of housework and childcare: wife's employment status, family stage, sex and family income in our study.

Level of Analysis

The research on marital satisfaction and the division of housework and childcare focuses on the individual, e.g. contrasting the marital satisfaction of men whose wives are employed versus husbands of housewives. Consistent with the previous research, we initially test our hypothesis at the individual level. However, a couple is a dynamic unit and it is possible to have couples in which both are highly satisfied or couples in which only one spouse is highly satisfied while the other is less satisfied. Couples in which both spouses are satisfied or both dissatisfied may or may not be the norm among employed couples or housewife couples. In a departure from previous research we have extended our hypothesis from the individual level of analysis to analysis at the level of the married couple. We propose that there are significant patterns of relationships between satisfaction with and perceptions of the distribution of housework and childcare and marital satisfaction for both employed and housewife couples. We have no a priori hypothesis about what these patterns will be, e.g. both high or low, one high one low, etc.

Method

Sample

Data were collected from a sample of male and female employees of a large midwestern high technology organization and their spouses. The sample was selected in the following way. All Chicago area employees received a mailing which included a letter from the firm's president encouraging employees to cooperate with a university study of worklife and family life and a letter from the researchers. The researchers' letter stated that married couples with children living

at home were being sought for the study. Couples interested in participating were asked to return a postcard to the researchers. Approximately 650 postcards were returned. From this group, 376 families were considered eligible for the study. Eligibility requirements included: married and living together; either both spouses are employed, or if only one spouse is employed it is the husband; children living in the home under the age of 18; no member of the immediate family for whom the adults in the household provide daily care or have ongoing responsibility who suffers from a chronic disease, impairment or handicap. Childless couples (177), couples with a sick/handicapped family member (67), and 31 couples who were not married or husband was unemployed were excluded.

Identical questionnaires, one for the husband, one for the wife, were sent to each of the 376 eligible couples. The response rate was 64 percent. The resulting file consists of 239 couples. In 136 of these couples, both spouses are employed and in 103 only the husband is employed. The analysis sample is slightly smaller due to missing data on some items.

The demographic characteristics of the sample are as follows: The average male is between 36 and 40 years old and does not have a college degree. He is working full time, earning between \$16,000-\$30,000 per year and has been in the workforce between 16 and 20 years. Twelve percent of the males hold blue collar occupations, 30 percent are managers and 58 percent hold other white collar jobs. The average female in the sample is between 31 and 35 years old, and is at least a high school graduate. Forty-three percent of these women are not working, 19 percent are working less than full time and

38 percent are working full time. Average annual earnings for the employed women are between \$11,000 and \$15,000.

Measures

Marital satisfaction was measured by the dyadic satisfaction scale published by Spanier (1976). In this study, the dyadic satisfaction mean was 40.99, standard deviation 5.69 on a range from 10-50, with coefficient alpha of .87.

Perceptions of share of housework and childcare were measured by asking each spouse two questions about own share:

With regard to childcare, do you feel you are doing:

With regard to housework, do you feel you are doing:

Answers: 1) much less than your share; 2) less than your share; 3) your share 4) more than your share; 5) much more than your share.

And two questions about spouse's share:

With regard to childcare, do you feel your spouse is doing:

With regard to housework, do you feel your spouse is doing:

Answers: 1) much less than his/her share; 2) less than his/her share; 3) his/her share; 4) more than his/her share; 5) much more than his/her share.

Satisfaction with housework and childcare arrangement was measured by two separate questions on a 5 point Likert-type scale, ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied.

Family stage, as suggested by Lansing and Kish (1957), Duvall (1957), Rodgers (1964), was measured by categorizing the family in one

of the following groups based on the age of the youngest child.

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. 0-12 months | 4. 6 years 1 month - 12 years |
| 2. 1 year 1 month - 3 years | 5. 12 years 1 month - 18 years |
| 3. 3 years 1 month - 6 years | 6. 18 years or more |

Family earned income was measured by adding together husband and wife's earned income for employed couples and using husband's income in housewife couples.

Analysis

At the individual level data were analyzed using step-wise multiple regression. At the couple level, canonical correlation was used. Canonical correlation analysis is a model which represents the relationship between two sets of variables as n correlations between n factors or linear combinations of the first set and n factors or linear combinations of the second set, with all other correlations among factors held to zero (Cooley and Lohnes, 1971). In this study interpretation is based on the correlations of the variables in each set with the n factors or linear combinations corresponding to each subsequent canonical correlation. These are commonly called structure correlations.

While, as Cooley and Lohnes (1971;176) point out, "The canonical model appears at first to be a complicated way of experiencing the relationship between two measurement batteries. In fact, it is the simplest analytic model that can begin to do justice to this difficult problem of scientific generalization". In this study, the canonical model has the additional feature of allowing us to explore fully the patterns of marital satisfaction and perceptions of the distribution of housework and childcare that are in our sample.

Results

Table 1 presents the correlations between the independent variables and marital satisfaction for the total sample and for each of the four subsamples: husbands of employed wives, employed wives, husbands of housewives, housewives. While none of the traditional predictors of marital satisfaction are significantly correlated with marital satisfaction, most of the correlations between marital satisfaction and satisfaction with and perceptions of the distribution of housework and childcare are significant. Marital satisfaction is significantly correlated with satisfaction with the housework arrangement in all four subsamples. Marital satisfaction is significantly correlated with arrangement for childcare in the subsamples of employed men and women. Housewives who are satisfied with their marriages rate themselves as doing less than their share of housework. Employed women who are satisfied with their marriages rate themselves as doing less than their share of childcare. There are no significant correlations between ratings of own share of housework and childcare and marital satisfaction for men. There are also significant correlations between marital satisfaction and perceiving that one's spouse is doing his/her share of housework and/or childcare in all four groups.

Tables 2 and 3 present the results of the step-wise regressions for the total sample and the four subsamples. In all the analyses, the four traditional predictors of marital satisfaction: family stage, wife employed, sex, family income, were entered together as the first step, followed by the two measures of satisfaction with the

arrangement for housework and childcare as the second step, followed by the four perceptions of own and spouse's share of housework and childcare as the third step. In the subsample analyses, sex and wife's employment status dropped out of the equations.

In no analysis did the traditional variable significantly predict marital satisfaction. For working couples, but not housewife couples, entering satisfaction with the arrangement for housework and/or childcare resulted in a significant prediction. In all four subgroups and the total sample perceptions of the distribution of housework and childcare added significantly to the prediction of marital satisfaction.

Table 3 presents the beta weights associated with the third step analysis. Among men with working wives, perceptions about housework and childcare do not add to the predictability of marital satisfaction over and above satisfaction with the arrangements. This is not true for any other group. Perceptions of share are particularly important predictors of satisfaction among employed women. These women think that they are not doing their share of childcare, but that they are doing their share of the housework, and so are their husbands.

The perception which distinguishes satisfied husbands of housewives from those who are dissatisfied is that the wife is doing more than her share of the housework. Those men who are dissatisfied with their marriages believe that their wives are not doing their fair share of the housework. Finally, housewives who are satisfied with their marriages believe they are doing less than their share of the housework and that their husbands are doing more than their share of the childcare.

Tables 4 and 5 present the results at the couples level of analysis. Here we distinguish satisfied couples from less satisfied ones. Table 4 presents the within spouse and between spouse correlations for marital satisfaction and satisfaction with housework and childcare and perceptions of own and spouse's share of housework and childcare. The correlations in this table are a little different from those in Table 1 because the sample is limited to couples with complete data. For working couples, the correlation between his and her marital satisfaction is .74 ($p \leq .01$); for housewife couples the correlation is .58 ($p \leq .01$). This table hints of a pattern that becomes clear in the canonical analysis in Table 5; namely, that there is more mutuality of feelings between spouses when both are employed than when the wife is not employed. Among dual-earner couples, husband's satisfaction with housework and childcare predicts the wife's marital satisfaction almost as well as his own marital satisfaction. Likewise, employed wives' satisfaction with arrangements for housework and childcare, as well as perceptions of husband's sharing of housework and childcare responsibilities, predict his marital satisfaction almost as well as these variables predict her own marital satisfaction. These crossover patterns do not repeat among the housewife couples. While satisfaction with arrangements and perceptions of equity with housework and childcare predict own marital satisfaction, these variables do not in general predict the spouse's marital satisfaction among housewife couples.

The canonical correlations presented at the bottom of Table 5 show that there are significant patterns of couples' marital satisfaction which are related to perceptions of division of housework

and childcare and satisfaction with present arrangement for housework and childcare. One significant pattern accounts for 38 percent of employed couples' marital satisfaction. Two significant patterns, together account for 35 percent of housewife couples' marital satisfaction. The structure correlations in Table 5 show that somewhat different factors predict marital satisfaction among employed couples than housewife couples.

Among dual-earner couples the significant pattern is dominated by both spouses having high marital satisfaction (husbands .92, wives .96), i.e. when he is satisfied with the marriage she is too and vice versa. The pattern has the following characteristics: both husbands and wives are satisfied with their present arrangement for housework and childcare, wife believes husband is doing his share and even more than his share of both housework and childcare, while she perceives herself as doing less than her share of childcare and marginally less than her share of housework. Thus, when dual-earner marriages are satisfactory, she is not happy with the amount of childcare and housework she does, but she is happy with what her spouse is doing and they are both happy with the arrangements for housework and childcare. Furthermore, in the dual-earner couples, the husband's perceptions of his own share of housework and childcare do not discriminate between couples who are satisfied with their marriages and those who are not. However, the wife's perceptions of his share of these matters is crucial and is more important than his perceptions of her share of childcare and housework.

The housewife group presents quite a different picture. In the first place we found two not one significant pattern and second, in

neither pattern were both spouses highly satisfied with the marriage.

The first pattern, which accounts for 24 percent of the variance in the couples' marital satisfaction is dominated by his marital satisfaction (.91). Her marital satisfaction is much less important (.43). The second pattern is dominated by her marital satisfaction (.90). His satisfaction does not really contribute in a positive or negative way to this pattern (.18).

The first pattern in the housewives' group shows the following characteristics: husband perceives his wife as doing her fair share of housework and childcare. His satisfaction with current childcare and housework arrangements and her satisfaction with housework arrangements contribute to a lesser extent to this pattern. Thus in the first pattern in the housewife couples we see that his marital satisfaction is correlated with a very stereotypic perception: she is doing most of the family work and he acknowledges that. As long as she accepts this situation, he is particularly satisfied with the marriage. Satisfaction with present arrangements is not as important as in the dual worker group.

The second pattern among the housewife couples, which is dominated by the housewife's high level of marital satisfaction, shows the following characteristics: he perceives her as not contributing her fair share of housework and particularly childcare. She agrees with him and perceives herself as doing less than her fair share of housework and childcare and that he is doing his share of housework and childcare. However, she is satisfied with housework and particularly childcare arrangements. His satisfaction with childcare contributes a little to this pattern, but his feelings about housework

arrangements not at all. The implication in this couples' pattern is that he would like her to increase her housework and childcare share and it is possible that the fact that she is not doing her fair share is related to his lower level of marital satisfaction.

Discussion

At the individual level for the most part, our hypothesis was confirmed, marital satisfaction is related to satisfaction with housework and childcare arrangements and the perceptions that one's spouse is doing his/her share of housework and childcare. The third part of our hypothesis was disconfirmed in two respects. Marital satisfaction is unrelated to men's perceptions that they are doing their own share of housework and/or childcare. Marital satisfaction is negatively related to perceptions of doing own share of housework (housewives) and negatively related to perceptions of doing own share of childcare (employed wives). These data suggest that contrary to our hypothesis, women who are happily married perceive themselves as doing less than their share of housework and/or childcare. It seems like the dynamic for happily married women is the following: the fact that I don't contribute my fair share of family work but you are willing to tolerate it and/or pick up my slack, makes me more satisfied with the marriage.

The perceptions of satisfied employed women that they are not doing their fair share of housework and particularly childcare even though their husbands do not perceive this to be true may be due to the fact that they still use housewives as a reference group for these traditional roles (Yogev, 1982b). These employed women are satisfied

with their marriages because they have worked out an equitable arrangement of sharing the housework and childcare with their husbands. Their husbands are also satisfied with the marriage, in part because they too perceive the arrangement as equitable.

The most straight forward explanation of the finding that housewives who are highly satisfied with their marriages, perceive that they are not doing their fair share of housework and childcare, is that they are not doing their fair share. Their husbands certainly do not think so. Yet, these women's marital satisfaction is similar to that of the employed women's marital satisfaction in that both groups perceive their husbands as doing their fair share of housework and childcare.

Our hypothesis at the couples level was confirmed. There were significant patterns of relationships between satisfaction with and perceptions of the distribution of housework and childcare and marital satisfaction for both employed and housewife couples. Among the employed couples the dominant pattern was both couples satisfied or both dissatisfied with the marriage. Among the housewife couples, two orthogonal patterns emerged, one dominated by his marital satisfaction the other by hers.

The couples analysis provides us with different insights into the dynamics of family life than we would see by simple analysis at the individual level. The dual earner couples show more integration of work and family and more mutuality as can be indicated by having more significant cross correlations between husbands and wives. The greater integration and cross prediction of feelings among the dual-earner couples than housewife couples suggests that when both

spouses take work and family roles and when each spouse is fulfilling the expectations the other spouse has about him/her, the marital relationship is strengthened. On the other hand, among the housewife couples, where there is less mutuality in satisfaction and more segregation of perceptions than among dual-earner couples, marital satisfaction is also less mutual.

In sum, at both the individual and couples level of analysis satisfaction with and perceptions of an equitable distribution of housework and childcare predict marital satisfaction. None of the traditional variables: income, family stage, wife's employment status, sex predicted marital satisfaction.

Perceiving one's spouse as doing his/her share of housework and/or childcare and even more than his/her share is a very important element for men and women in both the dual-earner and the housewife couples. These variables show consistent patterns of correlations in all four subject groups (Table 4). Thus, when spouses perceive each other as doing his/her share or more of housework and/or childcare, they are more likely to be happily married than when one spouse perceives the other as not contributing a fair share. For example, in the second canonical pattern, husbands of housewives perceived their wives doing less than their share of housework and childcare, and only the wives were satisfied with the marriage.

We do not mean to imply causality about the relationships between perceptions of the distribution of housework and childcare and marital satisfaction. It is possible that working successfully as a team with regard to housework and childcare contributes to a couple's marital satisfaction, or the opposite phenomenon, mutual marital satisfaction,

may make it easier to communicate and create an efficient and satisfying arrangement for childcare and housework.

Whichever the causal direction, the important result of this study is its demonstration of relationships between perceptions of the distribution of housework and childcare and marital satisfaction in all groups at both the individual and couples levels of analysis. Furthermore, even though our study focused only on people in middle family stages, i.e. children under 18 living at home, we have reason to believe that the strong relationship between marital satisfaction and the perception of the distribution of family work will exist also in other family stages. Hill & Dorfman (1982), who studied reactions of housewives to the retirement of their husbands, found the most consistent correlate of wife's satisfaction with marriage to be husband's participation in housework tasks.

There are no objective measures of share of housework and childcare in this study. We do not know how in reality--the number of hours or the number of chores are divided between husbands and wives. From past research we can assume that when the woman is working she still carries a disproportionate share of family work (Weingarten 1978, Pleck 1979). Thus it is quite likely "her share" will be actually greater than "his share". Similarly, we do not know whether husbands of housewives are actually doing less family work than husbands of employed women. The important finding of this study is that the psychological sense of equity in family work predicts marital satisfaction. As long as the subjective perception is equitable, i.e. each perceives that the other contributes what he/she is supposed to--marital satisfaction will be maintained and enhanced. We suspect,

had we been able to measure actual share in terms of hours or number of chores, that the correlations between these objective measures and marital satisfaction would not be nearly as strong as the correlations found here. There are two reasons for this prediction. First, to some extent our results capitalize on common method variance between two response variables. Second and most important, we think it is not what one's spouse does or does not do with respect to housework and childcare, but how the spouse's behavior is interpreted, i.e. she/he is not doing his/her fair share, which is important for marital satisfaction.

Oakley (1980) comments that the study of household labor has expanded over the last five years but, "there has been too much emphasis on the theoretical role of housework in the Marxist schema, and too little in the way of empirical work exposing attitudes, perceptions and satisfaction...Moreover, the extent to which the study of housework has been integrated with the main concerns of sociology and other disciplines has been disappointing..(p. 12)". This study was successful in integrating housework with marital satisfaction and exposing a crucial element of this relationship, i.e. the perception which distinguishes between spouses who are satisfied with marriage and those who are not is that the other spouse is doing his/her share of family work. Another important conclusion to bear in mind is that the psychological meaning of family work and the subjective degree of equity in family arrangements, should be the focus of research (particularly as marital satisfaction is concerned), as well as the proportional and absolute time and task data.

TABLE 1

Correlation between Marital Satisfaction and Independent
 Variables for the Total Sample, Husbands of Working Women,
 Working Women, Husbands of Housewives, Housewives

	Total sample	Husbands of working women	Working women	Husbands of housewives	Housewives
Family Stage	-.02	.09	-.07	.02	-.07
Sex	-.09	-	-	-	-
Wife Employed	.08	-	-	-	-
Family Income	-.01	.06	.02	-.11	-.06
Satisfaction/childcare	.29**	.35**	.30**	.18	.17
Satisfaction/housework	.33**	.34**	.34**	.20*	.25**
Perception Self/Childcare	-.20	.03	-.35**	-.16	-.14
Perception Self/Housework	-.15	-.08	-.14	-.13	-.28**
Perception Spouse/Childcare	.28**	.11	.44**	.19*	.26**
Perception Spouse/Housework	.32**	.21**	.41**	.25**	.12

* p<.05 level of significance

** p<.01 level of significance

TABLE 2

Step-wise Multiple Regressions
Predicting Marital Satisfaction

<u>Group</u>	<u>Step No.^a</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>Adj. R²</u>
Total Sample	1	.81	NS	.01
(N=354)	2	8.88	.01	.12
	3	9.34	.01	.19
Men, employed	1	.60	NS	0
wives	2	7.05	.01	.16
(N=131)	3	4.02	.01	.16
Employed	1	.34	NS	0
wives	2	4.82	.01	.11
(N=126)	3	6.33	.01	.25
Men, house-	1	.62	NS	.00
wives	2	1.56	NS	.02
(N=97)	3	2.38	.05	.10
Housewives	1	.31	NS	0
(N=88)	2	1.76	NS	.03
	3	2.21	.05	.10

a variables entered in Step 1: family stage, sex, employed wife, family income; step 2: satisfaction with housework and satisfaction with childcare arrangement; step 3: perceptions of own and spouse's behavior regarding housework and childcare sharing.

TABLE 3

Beta Weight for Step-wise Multiple Regressions

Predicting Marital Satisfaction

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Men employed wives</u>	<u>Employed wives</u>	<u>Men housewives</u>	<u>Housewives</u>
Family Stage	.24	.50	-.16	.30	-.41
Sex	.72	-	-	-	-
Wife Employed	-.36	-	-	-	-
Family Income	-.01	-.01	-.03	-.25	-.16
Satisfaction/Childcare	1.08 **	1.37 **	-.31	1.16	-.13
Satisfaction/Housework	.92 **	1.08 *	1.07 *	.70	1.08
Perception Self/Childcare	-1.49 **	-.32	-2.14 *	-1.76	-.09
Perception Self/Housework	1.02 *	.50	1.67 *	.87	-2.53 *
Perception Spouse/Childcare	.34	-.24	1.65	-.18	2.62 *
Perception Spouse/Housework	1.80 **	1.43	2.76 **	1.83 *	-1.91

* .05 level of significance

** .01 level of significance

Table 4

Correlations between Husbands and Wives Marital Satisfaction,
Satisfaction with Housework and Childcare Arrangements and
Perceptions of Equity for Dual-Earner and Housewife Couples

	<u>Dual-earner Couples</u>		<u>Housewife couples</u>	
	<u>husbands</u>	<u>wives</u>	<u>husbands</u>	<u>wives</u>
Men				
Satisfaction with childcare	.33**	.29**	.18*	.18*
Satisfaction with housework	.36**	.27**	.20*	
Perceptions of own share of childcare				
Perception of own share of housework		-.14*		
Perception of spouse's share of childcare				.19*
Perception of spouse's share of housework	.28**	.16*	.30**	
Women				
Satisfaction with childcare	.20**	.31**	.36**	
Satisfaction with housework	.25**	.36**	.18*	.28**
Perception of own share of childcare	-.20**	-.34**		
Perception of own share of housework		-.14*	-.19*	-.25**
Perception of spouse's share of childcare		.31**	.43**	.27**
Perception of spouse's share of housework	.32**	.39**		.16*

* p<.05

** p<.01

Table 5

Structure Correlations, Univariate F Tests; Step F Tests for Canonical Analysis of Employed and Housewife
Couples, Marital Satisfaction and Independent Variables

Independent Variables	Employed Couples			Housewife Couples		
	Structure Correlations	Univariate F	Step F	Structure Correlations	Univariate F	Step F
Family Stage	.06	NS	NS	.06	-.28	NS
Family Income	-.01	NS	NS	-.14	-.04	NS
His perception of own share of childcare	.00	NS	NS	-.26	.05	NS
Her perception of own share of childcare	-.44	.01	.01	.02	-.44	NS
His perception of own share of housework	-.18	NS	.05	-.24	.10	NS
Her perception of own share of housework	-.14	NS	NS	-.25	-.42	.05
His satisfaction with childcare	.47	.01	.01	.25	.23	NS
Her satisfaction with childcare	.40	.01	.05	-.02	.80	.01
His satisfaction with housework	.45	.01	NS	.31	-.04	NS
Her satisfaction with housework	.49	.01	.05	.22	.48	.05
His perception of spouse's share of childcare	.21	NS	.01	.36	-.47	.01
Her perception of spouse's share of childcare	.57	.01	NS	.16	.54	.05
His perception of spouse's share of housework	.35	.01	NS	.50	-.19	.01
Her perception of spouse's share of housework	.54	.01	.05	.11	.32	NS
Dependent Variables						
His Marital Satisfaction	.92			.98	.18	
Her Marital Satisfaction	.96			.43	.90	
Canonical Correlation	.66					.64
Variance Explained in Dependent Variables	38%			24%	11%	35%

REFERENCES

- Arnott, C. C.
1972 "Husbands' attitudes and wives' commitment to employment." Journal of Marriage and the Family 34:673-684.
- Axelson, L.
1963 "The marital adjustment and marital role definitions of husbands of working and nonworking wives." Marriage and Family Living 25 (May):189-195.
- Bahr, S. J.
1974 "Effects on power and division of labor in the family." Pp. 167-186 in Hoffman, L. W. & Nye, F. I. (Eds.), Working Mothers, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Bailyn, L.
1970 "Career and family orientation of husbands and wives in relation to marital happiness." Human Relations 22:97-113.
- Birnbaum, L. A. J.
1971 "Life patterns, personality style, and self-esteem in gifted family oriented and career-oriented women." Dissertation Abstracts International 32:1834-B.
- Blood, R. O.
1963 "The husband-wife relationship." In Nye, F. I. & Hoffman, L. W. (Eds.), Employed Mother in America, Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Blood, R. Jr., and D. Wolfe
1960 "Husbands and wives." New York Free Press, Chap. 3.
- Bryson, R., B. J. Bryson, and F. M. Johnson
1978 "Family size satisfaction or productivity in dual-career couples." Psychology of Women Quarterly 3:67-77.
- Campbell, A., P. E. Converse, and W. L. Rodgers
1976 "The quality of american life: Perceptions, evaluations, and satisfactions." New York: Russel Sage.
- Cooley, W. W., and P. R. Lohnes
1971 "Multivariate data analyses." New York: John Wiley & Sons
- Dizard, J.
1968 "Social change in the family." Chicago:University of Chicago Press
- Duvall, E. M.
1957 "Family Development." New York: J. P. Lippincott

REFERENCES

Page - 2

Garland, T. N.

- 1972 "The better half: The male in the dual-career professional family." Pp. 199-216 in C. Safillios-Rothschild (Ed.), Toward a Sociology of Women, Lexington:Xerox College Publishing

Gluck, R. N., E. Dannefer, and K. Milea

- 1980 "Women in families." Pp. 295-329 in A. E. Carter and M. McGoldrick (Eds.) The Family Life Cycle, Gardner Press, Chap. 13.

Gover, D. A.

- 1963 "Socio-Economic differential in the relationship between marital adjustment and wife's employment status." Marriage and the Family 25.

Hill, E. A., and L. T. Dorfman

- 1982 "Reaction of housewives to the retirement of their husbands." Family Relations 31:195-200.

Holmstrom, L. L.

- 1972 "The two career family." Cambridge:Schenckman Publishing Company.

Lansing, J. B., and L. Kish

- 1957 "Family life cycle as an independent variable." American Sociological Review 22:512-519.

Lee, G. R.

- 1978 "Marriage and morale in later life." Journal of Marriage and the Family 40:131-139.

Miller, S. M.

- 1972 "The making of a confused middle-aged husband." In C. Safilios-Rothschild (Ed.), Toward a Sociology of Women, Lexington:Xerox College Publishing

Nye, F. I., and L. W. Hoffman

- 1963 "The employed mother in america." New York:Rand McNally.

Oakely, A.

- 1980 "Reflections on the study of household labor." In F. S. Berk (Ed.) Women and Household Labor, New York:Sage

Paloma, M. M., and T. N. Garland

- 1971 "The married professional woman: A study in the tolerance of domestication." Journal of Marriage and the Family 33:531-540.

REFERENCES

Page - 3

- Perrucci, C. C., H. R. Potter, and L. D. Rhoads
1978 "Determinants of male family-role performance." Psychology of Women Quarterly 3:153-166.
- Pleck, J. H.
1979 "Men's Family Work: Three perspectives and some new data." The Family Coordinator 26:481:488.
- Price-Bonham, S. and D. C. Murphy
1980 "Dual-career marriages: Implications for the clinician." Journal of Marital and Family Therapy(April):181-188.
- Rapoport, R., and R. N. Rapoport
1969 "The dual-career family: A variant family and social change." Human Relations 22:3-30.
- Rapoport, R., and R. N. Rapoport
1971 "Further considerations on the dual-career family." Human Relations 24:519-533.
- Rice, G. D.
1979 "Dual career: Marriage: Conflict and treatment." New York:The Free Press.
- Riley, L. E. & E. A. Spreitzer
1974 "A model for the analysis of lifetime marriage patterns." Journal of Marriage and the Family 36:64-70.
- Rodgers, R. H.
1964 "Toward a theory of family development." Journal of Marriage and the Family 26:262-270.
- Rollins, B. C., and K. L. Cannon
1974 "Marital satisfaction over the family life cycle: A re-evaluation." Journal of Marriage and the Family 35:271-282.
- Safilios-Rothschild, C.
1970 "The influence of the wife's degree of work commitment upon some aspects of family organizations and dynamics." Journal of Marriage and the Family 32:681-691.
- Spanier, G. B.
1976 "Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads." Journal of Marriage and the Family 38:15-28.

REFERENCES

Page - 4

- Spanier, G. B., R. A. Lewis, and C. L. Cole
1975 "Marital adjustment over the family life cycle: The issue of curvilinearity." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 37(May): 263-275.
- Staines, G. L., J. H. Pleck, L. J. Shepard, and P. O'Conner
1978 "Wives' employment status and marital adjustment: Yet another look." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 3:90-120.
- Weingarten, K.
1978 "The employment pattern of professional couples and their distribution of involvement in the family." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 3:43-53.
- Yogev, S.
1982a "Happiness in dual-career couples: Changing values and research." *Sex Role Journal of Research* 8:593-605.
- Yogev, S.
1982b "Are professional women overworked: Objective vs. subjective perception of role loads." *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 55: 165-169.
- Yogev, S.
"Dual career couples: Conflicts and Treatment." *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, in press.
- Young, M., and P. Wilmott
1973 "The symmetrical family." New York:Pantheon.

442
JUL 82

452:KD:716:enj
78u452-883

LIST 1
MANDATORY

Defense Technical Information Center
ATTN: DTIC DDA-2
Selection and Preliminary Cataloging Section
Cameron Station
Alexandria, VA 22314 12 copies

Library of Congress
Science and Technology Division
Washington, D.C. 20540 3 copies

Office of Naval Research
Code 4420E
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217

Naval Research Laboratory
Code 2627
Washington, D.C. 20375 6 copies

Office of Naval Research
Director, Technology Programs
Code 200
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217

LIST 2
ONR FIELD

Psychologist
Office of Naval Research
Detachment, Pasadena
1030 East Green Street
Pasadena, CA 91106

Dr. James Lester
Office of Naval Research
Detachment, Boston
495 Summer Street
Boston, MA 02210

LIST 3
OPNAV

Deputy Chief of Naval Operations
(Manpower, Personnel, and Training)
Head, Research, Development, and
Studies Branch (Op-115)
1812 Arlington Annex
Washington, DC 20350

Director
Civilian Personnel Division (OP-14)
Department of the Navy
1803 Arlington Annex
Washington, DC 20350

Deputy Chief of Naval Operations
(Manpower, Personnel, and Training)
Director, Human Resource Management
Plans and Policy Branch (Op-150)
Department of the Navy
Washington, DC 20350

Deputy Chief of Naval Operations
(Manpower, Personnel, and Training)
Director, Human Resource Management
Plans and Policy Branch (Op-150)
Department of the Navy
Washington, DC 20350

Chief of Naval Operations
Head, Manpower, Personnel, Training
and Reserves Team (Op-964D)
The Pentagon, 4A478
Washington, DC 20350

Chief of Naval Operations
Assistant, Personnel Logistics
Planning (Op-987H)
The Pentagon, SD772
Washington, DC 20350

442
Mar 82

LIST 4
NAVMAT & NPRDC

NAVMAT

Program Administrator for Manpower,
Personnel, and Training
MAT-0722 (A. Rubenstein)
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217

Naval Material Command
Management Training Center
NAVMAT 09M32
Jefferson Plaza, Bldg #2, Rm 150
1421 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 20360

Naval Material Command
MAT-00K & MAT-00KB (1 copy each)
(J. W. Tweeddale)
OASN(SNL)
Crystal Plaza #5
Room 236
Washington, DC 20360

Naval Material Command
MAT-03
(J. E. Colvard)
Crystal Plaza #5
Room 236
Washington, DC 20360

NPRDC

Commanding Officer
Naval Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152 3 copies

Naval Personnel R&D Center
Dr. Robert Penn (1 copy)
Dr. Ed Aiken (1 copy)
San Diego, CA 92152

Navy Personnel R&D Center
Washington Liaison Office
Building 200, 2N
Washington Navy Yard
Washington, DC 20374

LIST 5
BUMED

452:KD:716:enj
78u452-883
Commanding Officer
Naval Health Research Center
San Diego, CA 92152

CDR William S. Maynard
Psychology Department
Naval Regional Medical Center
San Diego, CA 92134

Naval Submarine Medical
Research Laboratory
Naval Submarine Base
New London, Box 900
Groton, CT 06349

Director, Medical Service Corps
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery
Code 23
Department of the Navy
Washington, DC 20372

Naval Aerospace Medical
Research Lab
Naval Air Station
Pensacola, FL 32508

Program Manager for Human
Performance (Code 44)
Naval Medical R&D Command
National Naval Medical Center
Bethesda, MD 20014

Navy Medical R&D Command
ATTN: Code 44
National Naval Medical Center
Bethesda, MD 20014

LIST 6
NAVAL ACADEMY AND NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Naval Postgraduate School - (code 012)
ATTN: Dr. Richard S. Elster
Department of Administrative Sciences
Monterey, CA 93940

Naval Postgraduate School
ATTN: Professor John Senger
Operations Research and
Administrative Science
Monterey, CA 93940

Superintendent
Naval Postgraduate School
Code 1424
Monterey, CA 93940

Naval Postgraduate School
ATTN: Dr. James Arima
Code 54 EG
Monterey, CA 93940

Naval Postgraduate School
ATTN: Dr. Richard A. McGonigal
Code 54
Monterey, CA 93940

U.S. Naval Academy
ATTN: CDR J. M. McGrath
Department of Leadership and Law
Annapolis, MD 21402

Professor Carson K. Eoyang
Naval Postgraduate School, Code 54EG
Department of Administration Sciences
Monterey, CA 93940

Superintendent
ATTN: Director of Research
Naval Academy, U.S.
Annapolis, MD 21402

452:KD:716:enj
78u452-883

LIST 7

HRM

Officer in Charge
Human Resource Management Detachment
Naval Air Station
Alameda, CA 94591

Officer in Charge
Human Resource Management Detachment
Naval Submarine Base New London
P.O. Box 81
Groton, CT 06340

Officer in Charge
Human Resource Management Division
Naval Air Station
Mayport, FL 32228

Commanding Officer
Human Resource Management Center
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860

Commander in Chief
Human Resource Management Division
U.S. Pacific Fleet
Pearl Harbor, HI 96860

Officer in Charge
Human Resource Management Detachment
Naval Base
Charleston, SC 29408

Commanding Officer
Human Resource Management School
Naval Air Station Memphis
Millington, TN 38054

Human Resource Management School
Naval Air Station Memphis (96)
Millington, TN 38054

Commanding Officer
Human Resource Management Center
1300 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209

Commanding Officer
Human Resource Management Center
5621-23 Tidewater Drive
Norfolk, VA 23511

Commander in Chief
Human Resource Management Division
U.S. Atlantic Fleet
Norfolk, VA 23511

Officer in Charge
Human Resource Management Detachment
Naval Air Station Whidbey Island
Oak Harbor, WA 98278

Commanding Officer
Human Resource Management Center
Box 23
FPO New York 09510

Commander in Chief
Human Resource Management Division
U.S. Naval Force Europe
FPO New York 09510

Officer in Charge
Human Resource Management Detachment
Box 60
FPO San Francisco 96651

Officer in Charge
Human Resource Management Detachment
COMNAVFORJAPAN
FPO Seattle 98762

LIST 8
NAVY MISCELLANEOUS

Naval Military Personnel Command
HRM Department (NMPC-6)
Washington, DC 20350

(2 copies) Douglas B. Blackburn, Director
National Defense University
Mobilization Concepts Development
Center
Washington, D.C. 20319

Naval Training Analysis
and Evaluation Group
Orlando, FL 32813

Commanding Officer
ATTN: TIC, Bldg. 2068
Naval Training Equipment Center
Orlando, FL 32813

Chief of Naval Education
and Training (N-5)
Director, Research Development,
Test and Evaluation
Naval Air Station
Pensacola, FL 32508

Chief of Naval Technical Training
ATTN: Dr. Norman Kerr, Code 017
NAS Memphis (75)
Millington, TN 38054

Navy Recruiting Command
Head, Research and Analysis Branch
Code 434, Room 8001
801 North Randolph Street
Arlington, VA 22203

Commanding Officer
USS Carl Vinson (CVN-70)
Newport News Shipbuilding &
Drydock Company
Newport News, VA 23607

Naval Weapons Center
Code 094
China Lake, CA 93555 (C. Erickson)

Jesse Orlansky
Institute for Defense Analyses
1801 North Beauregard Street
Alexandria, VA 22311

Navy Health Research Center
Technical Director
P.O. Box 85122
San Diego, CA 92138

LIST 9
USMC

Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps
Code MPI-20
Washington, DC 20380

Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps
ATTN: Dr. A. L. Slafkosky,
Code RD-1
Washington, DC 20380

Education Advisor
Education Center (E031)
MCDEC
Quantico, VA 22134

Commanding Officer
Education Center (E031)
MCDEC
Quantico, VA 22134

Commanding Officer
U.S. Marine Corps
Command and Staff College
Quantico, VA 22134

P4-5/A20

Sequential by Principal Investigator

LIST 10
DARPA

Defense Advanced Research
Projects Agency (3 copies)
Director, Cybernetics
Technology Office
1400 Wilson Blvd, Rm 625
Arlington, VA 22209

Mr. Michael A. Daniels
International Public Policy
Research Corporation
6845 Elm Street, Suite 212
McLean, VA 22101

Dr. A. F. K. Organski
Center for Political Studies
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Dr. Douglas Hunter
Defense Intelligence School
Washington, DC 20374

Dr. Brian Usilaner
GAO
Washington, DC 20548

National Institute of Education
ATTN: [REDACTED]
EOLC/SMO Ms. Gail McCall
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20208

National Institute of Mental Health
Division of Extramural Research Programs
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20852

National Institute of Mental Health
Minority Group Mental Health Programs
Room 7 - 102
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20852

Office of Personnel Management
Office of Planning and Evaluation
Research Management Division
1900 E Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20415

Office of Personnel Management
ATTN: Ms. Carolyn Burstein
1900 E Street, NW.
Washington, DC 20415

Office of Personnel Management
ATTN: Mr. Jeff Kane
Personnel R&D Center
1900 E Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20415

Chief, Psychological Research Branch
ATTN: Mr. Richard Lanterman
U.S. Coast Guard (G-P-1/2/TP42)
Washington, DC 20593

Social and Developmental Psychology
Program
National Science Foundation
Washington, DC 20550

Dr. Earl Potter
U.S. Coast Guard Academy
New London, CT 06320

Note
Page
of

P4-5/A25
Sequential by State/City

452:KD:716:enj
78u452-883

LIST 12
ARMY

Headquarters, FORSCOM
ATTN: AFPR-HR
Ft. McPherson, GA 30330

Army Research Institute
Field Unit - Leavenworth
P.O. Box 3122
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027

Technical Director
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Director
Systems Research Laboratory
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Director
Army Research Institute
Training Research Laboratory
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. T. O. Jacobs
Code PERI-IM
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

COL Howard Prince
Head, Department of Behavior
Science and Leadership
U.S. Military Academy, New York 10996

LIST 13
AIR FORCE

Air University Library
LSE 76-443
Maxwell AFB, AL 36112

COL John W. Williams, Jr.
Head, Department of Behavioral
Science and Leadership
U.S. Air Force Academy, CO 80840

MAJ Robert Gregory
USAFA/DFBL
U.S. Air Force Academy, CO 80840

AFOSR/NL (Dr. Fregly)
Building 410
Bolling AFB
Washington, DC 20332

Department of the Air Force
MAJ BOSSART
HQUSAF/MPXHL
Pentagon
Washington, DC 20330

Technical Director
AFHRL/MO(T)
Brooks AFB
San Antonio, TX 78235

AFMPC/MPCYPR
Randolph AFB, TX 78150

DR. Mary Lozano
Walter Reed Army Medical Center
W. R. Army Institute of Research
Division of Neuropsychiatry
Forest Glen
Washington DC 20012

LIST 14
MISCELLANEOUS

Australian Embassy
Office of the Air Attaché (S3B)
1601 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

British Embassy
Scientific Information Officer
Room 509
3100 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20008

Canadian Defense Liaison Staff,
Washington
ATTN: CDRD
2450 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20008

LT Gerald R. Stoffer, USN
Naval Aerospace Medical Institute
Code 11
Naval Air Station
Pensacola, Florida 32508

Commandant, Royal Military
College of Canada
ATTN: Department of Military
Leadership and Management
Kingston, Ontario K7L 2W3

National Defence Headquarters
ATTN: DPAR
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0K2

Mr. Luigi Petrullo
2431 North Edgewood Street
Arlington, VA 22207

Sequential by Principal Investigator

LIST 15
CURRENT CONTRACTORS

Nov. 82

Dr. Clayton P. Alderfer
Yale University
School of Organization and Management
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

Dr. J. Richard Hackman
School of Organization
and Management
Box 1A, Yale University
New Haven, CT 06520

Dr. Richard D. Arvey
University of Houston
Department of Psychology
Houston, TX 77004

Dr. Jerry Hunt
College of Business Administration
Texas Tech. University (Pox 4320)
Lubbock, TX 79409

~~Dr. Stuart W. Cook
Institute of Behavioral Science #6
University of Colorado
Box 482
Boulder, CO 80309~~

Dr. Richard Ilgen
Department of Psychological
Sciences
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907

Dr. L. L. Cummings
Kellogg Graduate School of Management
Northwestern University
Nathaniel Leverone Hall
Evanston, IL 60201

Dr. Lawrence R. James
School of Psychology
Georgia Institute of
Technology
Atlanta, GA 30332

Dr. Richard Daft
Texas A&M University
Department of Management
College Station, TX 77843

Dr. David Johnson
Professor, Educational Psychology
330 Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Bruce J. Bueno De Mesquita
University of Rochester
Department of Political Science
Rochester, NY 14627

Dr. F. Craig Johnson
Department of Educational
Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306

Dr. Henry Emurian
The Johns Hopkins University
School of Medicine
Department of Psychiatry and
Behavioral Science
Baltimore, MD 21205

Dr. Allan P. Jones
University of Houston
4800 Calhoun
Houston, TX 77004

Dr. Arthur Gerstenfeld
University Faculty Associates
710 Commonwealth Avenue
Newton, MA 02159

Dr. Dan Landis
Department of Psychology
Purdue University
Indianapolis, IN 46205

Dr. Paul S. Goodman
Graduate School of Industrial
Administration
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Frank J. Landy
The Pennsylvania State University
Department of Psychology
417 Bruce V. Moore Building
University Park, PA 16802

LIST 15 - Cont'd

Page - 2

Dr. Bibb Latane
The University of North Carolina
at Chapel Hill
Manning Hall 026A
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Dr. Edward E. Lawler
University of Southern California
Graduate School of Business
Administration
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Dr. Edwin A. Locke
College of Business and Management
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Dr. Fred Luthans
Regents Professor of Management
University of Nebraska - Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68588

Dr. R. R. Mackie
Human Factors Research
Canyon Research Group
5775 Dawson Street
Goleta, CA 93117

Dr. William H. Mobley
College of Business Administration
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843

Dr. Lynn Oppenheim
Wharton Applied Research Center
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dr. Thomas M. Ostrom
The Ohio State University
Department of Psychology
116E Stadium
404C West 17th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210

Dr. William G. Ouchi
University of California,
Los Angeles
Graduate School of Management
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dr. Charles Perrow
Yale University
I. S. P. S.
111 Prospect Avenue
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

Dr. Irwin G. Sarason
University of Washington
Department of Psychology, NI-25
Seattle, WA 98195

Dr. Benjamin Schneider
Department of Psychology
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Dr. Edgar H. Schein
Massachusetts Institute of
Technology
Sloan School of Management
Cambridge, MA 02139

H. Ned Seelye
International Resource
Development, Inc.
P.O. Box 721
La Grange, IL 60525

Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko
Program Director, Manpower Research
and Advisory Services
Smithsonian Institution
801 N. Pitt Street, Suite 120
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Richard M. Steers
Graduate School of Management
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

Dr. Siegfried Streufert
The Pennsylvania State University
Department of Behavioral Science
Milton S. Hershey Medical Center
Hershey, PA 17033

Dr. James R. Terborg
University of Oregon
West Campus
Department of Management
Eugene, OR 97403

Dr. Harry C. Triandis
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Howard M. Weiss
Purdue University
Department of Psychological
Sciences
West Lafayette, IN 47907

Dr. Philip G. Zimbardo
Stanford University
Department of Psychology
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Sara Kiesler
Carnegie-Mellon University
Dept of Social Science
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Sara Yogeve
Assistant Professor
Center for Urban Affairs
and Policy Research
Northwestern University
2040 Sheridan Road
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Jeanne Brett
Professor
Kellogg Graduate School of
Management
Northwestern University
3-186 Leverone Building
Evanston, Illinois 60201

U211460